

mill depots that sell the subject imports, any discussion of issues relating to this information will necessitate disclosure of business proprietary information (BPI). Thus, such discussions can only occur if a portion of the hearing is held *in camera*. In making this decision, the Commission nevertheless reaffirms its belief that whenever possible its business should be conducted in public.

The hearing will include the usual public presentations by petitioner and by respondents, with questions from the Commission. In addition, the hearing will include an *in camera* session for a presentation including BPI by petitioner and for questions from the Commission relating to the BPI, followed by a presentation including BPI by respondents, followed by questions from the Commission relating to the BPI. For any *in camera* session the room will be cleared of all persons except: those who have been granted access to BPI under a Commission administrative protective order (APO) and are included on the Commission's APO service list in this investigation. See 19 CFR 201.35(b)(1), (2). In addition, if petitioner's BPI will be discussed in the *in camera* session, personnel of petitioner will also be granted access to the closed session while such data is discussed. Similarly, if BPI of respondents' witnesses will be discussed in the *in camera* session, respondents' witnesses will also be granted access to the closed session while such data is discussed. See 19 CFR 201.35(b)(1), (2). The time for the parties' presentations and rebuttals in the *in camera* session will be taken from their respective overall allotments for the hearing. All persons planning to attend the *in camera* portions of the hearing should be prepared to present proper identification.

Authority: The General Counsel has certified, pursuant to Commission Rule 201.39 (19 CFR 201.39) that, in her opinion, a portion of the Commission's hearing in *Stainless Steel Angle from Japan*, Inv. No. 731-TA-699 (Final) may be closed to the public to prevent the disclosure of BPI.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: March 27, 1995.

Donna R. Koehnke,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-7859 Filed 3-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Information Collections Under Review

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has been sent the following collection(s) of information proposals

for review under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 USC Chapter 35) and the Paperwork Reduction Reauthorization Act since the last list was published. Entries are grouped into submission categories, with each entry containing the following information:

- (1) The title of the form/collection;
- (2) The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection.
- (3) Who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract;
- (4) An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond;
- (5) An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection; and,
- (6) An indication as to whether Section 3504(h) of Public Law 96-511 applies.

Comments and/or suggestions regarding the item(s) contained in this notice, especially regarding the estimated public burden and associated response time, should be directed to the OMB reviewer, Mr. Jeff Hill on (202) 395-7340 and to the Department of Justice's Clearance Officer, Mr. Robert B. Briggs, on (202) 514-4319. If you anticipate commenting on a form/collection, but find that time to prepare such comments will prevent you from prompt submission, you should notify the OMB reviewer and the Department of Justice Clearance Officer of your intent as soon as possible. Written comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of the collection may be submitted to Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503, and to Mr. Robert B. Briggs, Department of Justice Clearance Officer, Systems Policy Staff/Information Resources Management/Justice Management Division Suite 850, WCTR, Washington, DC 20530.

New Collection

- (1) Certification of Compliance with the Statutory Eligibility Requirements of the Violence Against Women Act for Tribal Governments
- (2) Violence Against Women Program Office, United States Department of Justice.
- (3) Primary—State, Local or Tribal Government, Others—None. The Crime Act of 1994 enacted the Violence Against Women Program. This program awards grant money to the states, territories, and Indian tribal governments to combat violence against women. The actual legislation dictates that in order to receive federal monies,

these grantees must certify that rape exams will be paid for by some entity other than the victim, and the victim will also not incur the cost of filing fees for criminal charges.

(4) 20 annual respondents at .15 hours per response.

(5) 5 annual burden hours.

(6) Not applicable under Section 3504(h) of Public Law 96-511.

Public comment on this item is encouraged.

Dated: March 23, 1995.

Robert B. Briggs,

Department Clearance Officer, Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 95-7685 Filed 3-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-21-M

Information Collections Under Review

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has been sent the following collection(s) of information proposals for review under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 USC Chapter 35) and the Paperwork Reduction Reauthorization Act since the last list was published. Entries are grouped into submission categories, with each entry containing the following information:

- (1) The title of the form/collection;
- (2) The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection.
- (3) Who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract;
- (4) An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond;
- (5) An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection; and,
- (6) An indication as to whether Section 3504(h) of Public Law 96-511 applies.

Comments and/or suggestions regarding the item(s) contained in this notice, especially regarding the estimated public burden and associated response time, should be directed to the OMB reviewer, Mr. Jeff Hill on (202) 395-7340 and to the Department of Justice's Clearance Officer, Mr. Robert B. Briggs, on (202) 514-4319. If you anticipate commenting on a form/collection, but find that time to prepare such comments will prevent you from prompt submission, you should notify the OMB reviewer and the Department of Justice Clearance Officer of your intent as soon as possible. Written comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of the collection may be submitted to Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs,

Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503, and to Mr. Robert B. Briggs, Department of Justice Clearance Officer, Systems Policy Staff/Information Resources Management/Justice Management Division Suite 850, WCTR, Washington, DC 20530.

New Collection

(1) Certification of Compliance with the Statutory Eligibility Requirements of the Violence Against Women Act.

(2) Violence Against Women Program Office, United States Department of Justice.

(3) Primary = State, Local or Tribal Government, Others = None. The Crime Act of 1994 enacted the Violence Against Women Program. This program awards grant money to the states, territories, and Indian tribal governments to combat violence against women. The actual legislation dictates that in order to receive federal monies, these grantees must certify that rape exams will be paid for by some entity other than the victim, and the victim will also not incur the cost of filing fees for criminal charges.

(4) 54 annual respondents at .15 hours per response.

(5) 13.5 annual burden hours.

(6) Not applicable under Section 3504(h) of Public Law 96-511.

Public comment on this item is encouraged.

Dated: March 23, 1995.

Robert B. Briggs,

Department Clearance Officer, Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 95-7686 Filed 3-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-21-M

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 94-70]

Zack B. Brown, M.D.; Denial of Application

On February 25, 1994, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Zack B. Brown, M.D. (Respondent) of Detroit, Michigan, proposing to deny his application for registration as a practitioner. The statutory basis for the Order to Show Cause was the Respondent's registration would be inconsistent with the public interest pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(f).

Respondent, through counsel, requested a hearing on the issues raised in the Order to Show Cause and the matter was docketed before Administrative Law Judge Mary Ellen Bittner.

On September 30, 1994, following prehearing procedures and prior to any evidentiary hearing, the Government filed a motion for summary disposition alleging that Respondent no longer held state authorization to handle controlled substances following the suspension of Respondent's license to practice medicine in Michigan by the Michigan Board of Medicine. Respondent did not file a response to the Government's motion and did not deny that his state license to handle controlled substances had been suspended.

On October 17, 1994, the administrative law judge entered her Opinion and Recommended Decision granting the Government's motion for summary disposition and recommending that the Respondent's application for DEA Certificate of Registration be denied. No exceptions were filed by either party.

On November 21, 1995, the administrative law judge transmitted the record to the Deputy Administrator. After a careful consideration of the record in its entirety, the Deputy Administrator enters his final order in this matter pursuant to 21 CFR 1316.67, based on findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth herein.

On August 17, 1994, the Michigan Board of Medicine summarily suspended the Respondent's state license to practice medicine. On September 26, 1994, an Order Continuing the Summary Suspension of August 17 was issued by the Michigan Office of Legal Services (Department of Commerce). Judge Bittner found that, by virtue of the suspension of Respondent's license to practice medicine in Michigan, it was reasonable to infer, and Respondent did not deny, that because he is not authorized to practice medicine in Michigan, he also is not authorized to handle controlled substances within that state. Judge Bittner concluded that DEA has no authority to register a practitioner, unless that practitioner is authorized by the state to dispense controlled substances. The DEA has consistently held this position. See *Bobby Watts, M.D.*, 53 FR 11919 (1988); *Lawrence R. Alexander, M.D.*, 57 FR 22256 (1992).

In cases such as the present, where a Respondent is not authorized to handle controlled substances in the state in which he proposes to practice, a motion for summary disposition is properly entertained. It is well settled that where no question of fact exists, or where the material facts are agreed, a plenary administrative proceeding is not required. See *Phillip E. Kirk, M.D.*, 48 FR 32877 (1983), *aff'd sub nom Kirk v. Mullen*, 749 F.2d 297 (6th Cir. 1984).

Congress did not intend for administrative agencies to conduct hearings where no issues remain in dispute. *United States v. Consolidated Mines and Smelting Company, Ltd.*, 445 F.2d 432, 453 (9th Cir. 1971); *N.L.R.B. v. International Association of Bridge, Structural and Ornamental Ironworkers, AFL-CIO*, 549 F.2d 634 (9th Cir. 1977).

The Deputy Administrator adopts the opinion and recommended decision of the administrative law judge in its entirety. Based on the foregoing, the Deputy Administrator concludes that Respondent's application for registration must be denied. 21 U.S.C. 823(f) and 824(a)(3). Accordingly, the Deputy Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, pursuant to the authority invested in him by 21 U.S.C. 823 and 824, and 28 CFR 0.100(b) and 0.104, hereby orders that the application for registration of Zack B. Brown be, and hereby is, denied. This order is effective April 28, 1995.

Dated: March 23, 1995.

Stephen H. Greene,

Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95-7642 Filed 3-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-M

Immigration and Naturalization Service

[INS No. 1689-95; AG Order No. 1959-95]

RIN 1115-AC30

Extension of Designation of Liberia Under Temporary Protected Status Program

AGENCY: Immigration and Naturalization Service, Justice.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice extends, until March 28, 1996, the Attorney General's designation of Liberia under the Temporary Protected Status program provided for in section 244A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended ("the Act"). Accordingly, eligible aliens who are nationals of Liberia, or who have no nationality and who last habitually resided in Liberia, may re-register for Temporary Protected Status and extension of employment authorization. This re-registration is limited to persons who already registered for the initial period of Temporary Protected Status, which ended on March 27, 1992. In addition during the extension period, some aliens may be eligible for late initial registration pursuant to 8 CFR 240.2(f)(2).

EFFECTIVE DATES: This extension of designation is effective on March 29,